UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,114	09/24/2003	Akihiko Mochida	17049	7178

23389 7590 12/06/2007

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER	
CZEKAJ, DAVID J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/670,114	MOCHIDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dave Czekaj	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 September 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *4-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *4-9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

On pages 7-9, applicant argues that none of the references disclose the frequency dividing circuit is in the endoscope. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Takahashi column 6, lines 5-9. There Takahashi discloses the endoscope comprises a flexible conduit and a video processor. Takahashi further discloses in column 10, lines 1-5, a frequency divider located within the PLL circuit which is connected to the video processor. Since the video processor is part of the endoscope, the frequency divider is located within the endoscope. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

Regarding the argument of claim 5 on page 9, note the updated rejection for claim 5 below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karasawa (US 5,196,928) in view of Loonen (5255092) in further view of Takahashi et al. (6466256), (hereinafter referred to as "Takahashi").

As for claim 4, 8, and 9, Karasawa teaches of an image pickup element that constitutes one image-captured surface by arranging a plurality of scanning lines having

a first number of pixels (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 38-42); a drive circuit for outputting to the image pickup element a drive signal with a first frequency for sequentially reading an image-captured signal image- captured on the image pickup surface of the image pickup element for every scanning line (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 43-45); a line memory having a memory capacity which can store one scanning line of image-captured signals read from the image pickup element (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 47-65); a writing signal generating circuit for outputting a writing signal with the first frequency to the line memory and for writing the image-captured signal and a reading signal generating circuit for outputting a reading signal with a frequency to the line memory and for reading image-captured signals stored in one scanning line (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 47-65); a video signal processing circuit for performing video signal processing on the image-captured signals read with the second frequency from the line memory (Karasawa: Column 3, Lines 43-47). However, Karasawa fails to disclose reading a signal with a second frequency which is higher than the first frequency and the frequency dividing circuit as claimed. Loonen teaches that prior art computing systems cannot accurately adjust a clock frequency (Loonen: column 1, lines 35-55). To help alleviate this problem, Loonen discloses "reading a signal with a second frequency which is higher than the first write frequency" (Loonen: column 3, lines 40-50). Takahashi teaches that feeding a digital signal to a remote peripheral is not expedient (Takahashi: column 2, lines 25-26). To help alleviate this problem, Takahashi discloses an apparatus comprising an oscillator for generating a clock signal having a preset frequency, the oscillator is provided in a camera control unit to which

the endoscope is removable connected (Takahashi: column 9, line 57 – column 10, line 5; column 7, lines 5-7, wherein the oscillator is part of the video processor which is connectable to the endoscope) and a frequency dividing circuit which divides the clock signal to generate a signal for the drive circuit (Takahashi: column 10, lines 1-5, wherein the frequency dividing circuit is the frequency demultiplier). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Karasawa, add the different frequencies taught by Loonen, and add the processing taught by Takahashi in order to obtain an apparatus that can accurately adjust a clock signal to correctly display a video signal.

As for claim 5, most of the limitations of the claim have been discussed in the above rejection of claim 4. Karasawa also teaches of the video signal processing means has an enlarge/reduce processing function for performing horizontal enlargement or reduction (Karasawa : Column 5, Lines 1-8) and Takahashi teaches the reduction is based on a ratio between the first and second frequency (Takahashi: column 10, lines 35-49).

As for claim 6, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to superimpose an input image with the captured image (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order more easily provide information to a user.

As for claim 7, most of the limitations of the claim have been discussed in the above rejection of claim 4. Karasawa also teaches of adding a second image pickup unit, which shows greater detail than the first but with all the circuitry mentioned above (Karasawa : Column 2, Lines 58-68).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DJC

Mehrdad Dastouri

MEHRDAD DASTOURI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC 2600